EXHIBIT 1

1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. GIANFORTI: Good morning, your Honor, Ben Gianforti for the government.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. WRIGHT: Good morning as well, your Honor,
Christopher Wright for Charlie Hernandez, who is present today
in court seated to my immediate right.

THE COURT: Good morning to you as well.

This matter is on for sentencing. Mr. Hernandez pled guilty in July to operating an unlicensed money transmitting business.

In connection with today's proceeding I have reviewed the following submissions: The presentence investigation report, dated October 30; Mr. Hernandez's sentencing memorandum, dated December 10, with accompanying exhibits; and the government's sentencing memorandum, dated December 13.

Have the parties received each of these submissions?

MR. GIANFORTI: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, we have.

THE COURT: I want to note, I thought the submissions on both sides were really excellent, so I want to thank you for that.

Why don't we begin by discussing the presentence report, which is prepared by the probation department.

Mr. Wright, have you read the presentence report and

discussed the federal sentencing guidelines.

Do you remember that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The guidelines, as you know, are a set of rules that are published by the United States Sentencing Commission, and they are designed to guide judges when they impose sentence. Although at one time they were mandatory,

meaning judges were required to follow the guidelines, they are no longer binding, but judges must nonetheless properly ensure that they are calculating the guidelines properly and consider

Do the parties agree with the guidelines calculation in the presentence report, pursuant to which Mr. Hernandez's offense level is 17, his criminal history category is I, and his recommended guidelines sentence is 24 to 30 months?

MR. GIANFORTI: Yes.

them in imposing sentence.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. The defense agrees.

THE COURT: I agree as well. I did my own independent calculation of the guidelines, and I agree with the calculation in the presentence report.

As I said a moment ago, that range is only advisory.

Courts can impose a sentence outside of that range based on one of two legal concepts, a departure or a variance. A departure allows for a sentence outside of the advisory range based on some provision in the guidelines themselves. In the plea agreement both parties, however, agree that no departure from the guidelines range is warranted, and I just want to confirm that that's correct.

MR. GIANFORTI: Yes, your Honor.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. That's correct.

THE COURT: Nevertheless, I have considered whether there is an appropriate basis for departure from the advisory

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

range. And while recognizing that I have the authority to

depart, I don't find any grounds warranting a departure under

 $3 \parallel$ the guidelines.

But I do, of course, also have the ability to impose a nonguidelines sentence based on what we call a variance pursuant to the factors set forth in 18 United States Code Section 3553(a). And I know that that is what Mr. Hernandez is seeking, and the government is not objecting, although it's advocating for a three-month, is my understanding.

I just want to confirm before we proceed that none of the codefendants have been sentenced yet, is that correct?

MR. GIANFORTI: That's right. Mr. Hernandez is the first of the five flight attendants that were charged.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Would the government like to be heard?

MR. GIANFORTI: Yes, your Honor. May I address the Court from the podium?

THE COURT: Yes. Just please speak into the microphone.

MR. GIANFORTI: Your Honor, as you rightly noted, the government is seeking a sentence of approximately three months in this case.

Your Honor, this is a difficult case, and I think that's reflected in the government's sentencing submission, the defendant's sentencing submission because, on the one hand, the

conduct here is very serious, and I want to talk a little bit
more about that. But on the other hand, Mr. Hernandez has a
lot going on, I think a lot of things that are mitigating in a
case like this, so that's why the government arrived at its
recommendation, which I think reflects on our part a delicate
balancing of all these things.

Let me walk through what our thinking was around our recommendation.

Your Honor, while the guidelines here reflect a relatively modest dollar amount that's at issue, we essentially held Mr. Hernandez responsible for that one money drop that we were following and were aware of, the \$120,000 one that's mentioned in the underlying complaint.

But, of course, the presentence report, which is unobjected to, says that Mr. Hernandez, over the course of the five or so years that he was doing this for our cooperator, moved something like 2 or \$3 million in drug money over the course of that, so he is doing this repeatedly over and over again.

If you do the math on it, the one money drop that's the focus of the complaint, it looked like he was going to try to do about \$60,000, and that is what his then codefendant, Sara Pujols, got caught with, about \$60,000.

If you think about how much cash you can kind of realistically bring with you on any given run in your luggage,

in your bag, whatever, he is not going to be able to bring a million dollars at a time. You can't pack that much cash into a carry-on bag, let's say.

Let's assume that he is doing runs on the order of magnitude of about \$60,000, maybe a little bit more than that. If you sort of divide that into the 2 or \$3 million that we estimate that he did over those five years, that's a lot of runs. He is doing this repeatedly.

I think it's also important to keep in mind the broader context of the government's case as a whole, really the case against our cooperator's money-laundering organization as a whole. And just the piece that we took down, these five flight attendants, if you aggregate the estimated amounts of money that they were moving, it ends up being 10, 15, \$20 million. That's just what we are aware of.

Just to give you a sense, our cooperator was an incredibly successful mover of drug money from this area to the Dominican Republic for many, many years, and we caught just a piece of it.

I think it's also important to remember that these are not marijuana dealers that he is moving money for. They are moving opioids in bulk, some of them laced with fentanyl. I know this because our cooperator actually sold some of those pills to us before we charged him.

And these aren't just sort of run-of-the-mill

businessmen in the drug trade. These are dangerous drug dealers. On multiple times during the course of this investigation our cooperator has been personally threatened by the drug dealers that he has had as clients for not being able to move money when they want him to, money maybe going missing, things like that. These are people who are prepared to kill, frankly, if their business is disrupted.

Mr. Hernandez was a conduit for these people. He allowed their money to get from here, where they don't want it, because they can't spend it, down to the Dominican Republic so they can live high in the hog down there. Your Honor, you have seen enough drug cases to know that this is a lucrative trade and opioids — this country is awash in opioids, and Mr. Hernandez reflects a very small slice of it, but nonetheless an important part of it.

Your Honor, I would also like to just underline again that Mr. Hernandez really abused the position of trust here with his known crew-member status. In fact, you wouldn't have been aware of this, your Honor, but before the PSR was finalized, there was some discussion between myself and the probation office about whether the abuse-of-trust enhancement under 31.3 was applicable here.

THE COURT: I actually was going to ask about that.

MR. GIANFORTI: I went back and forth with at least one or two of the lawyers that represent these flight

1 attendants, and they convinced me that it's not applicable 2 here. If you look at the notes below that guideline, it 3 basically contemplates somebody who has got like a fiduciary 4 relationship with a client -- a lawyer with their client or an 5 investment manager with their client where they are abusing 6 that position of discretion, trust, etc., and it explicitly 7 says below that that this enhancement does not apply to say a 8 bank teller who just has access to money by virtue of being a 9 bank teller.

Given all of those facts and given what happened here, we agreed, the government agreed, that that enhancement was not applicable here.

THE COURT: But I will say -- and I am glad you raised this, because it feels like a breach of trust.

MR. GIANFORTI: I agree.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Given the way in which our airports and our airlines are tied with national security, it feels like that, and it's a fair issue to raise, even if it doesn't affect the guidelines.

MR. GIANFORTI: I think it's one of these things where it's a little bit like what I said a moment ago about the amount of money that we think that he moved over the course of those five years. It's not reflected in the guidelines, but that doesn't mean that your Honor has to close your eyes to it. It is the same thing here. I think you're quite right, there

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was an abuse of trust. Airports are the front lines in this country. They keep bad stuff out, to the extent they can, and they keep bad stuff in, to the extent they can, so, in this case, drug money.

Mr. Hernandez had this status. He knew that it meant he wasn't going to get a close look at the airport, and he abused it. As I say, he abused it repeatedly.

Your Honor, I think I also would just like to highlight again that there really is a need for general deterrence in this case. I'll tell you that in the course of this investigation I spoke to JetBlue. I spoke to some of the other airlines that are involved in this investigation.

Frankly, I was shocked that this kind of conduct, the smuggling of bulk cash, was really not a risk that they were There weren't trainings. There weren't compliance alive to. There really wasn't anything that these airlines controls. were doing other than just saying, don't break the law, but like nothing specific about this particular risk. Particularly along routes like New York to the Dominican Republic, where huge drug market here, huge amount of drug dealing coming out of the Dominican Republic, nothing is in place.

I think even a short term of imprisonment here will send a general message to the airline industry that this is incredibly serious. They need to take it seriously. Every flight attendant in the airline business in the United States 1 | needs to take this seriously.

2.1

Your Honor, again, while the government is very sympathetic to the defendant's personal circumstances, I think a term of imprisonment is still necessary here because of that general deterrence factor, and I have every confidence that the Bureau of Prisons, for whatever stay your Honor imposes, if any, will be able to take care of Mr. Hernandez during that period.

Your Honor, just another note that I think I didn't include in our sentencing submission is that I've really come to view this case not as a case about greed, necessarily.

Really, it seemed like the people that were involved in this money movement were kind of just doing it for a little extra cash on the side.

Mr. Hernandez, by the end of his time at JetBlue, was actually making a pretty sizeable salary, as you know. But some of these folks that are less senior are really not making a lot of money. I think that they are unionized, and they are really not making a ton of money.

I think it's important for your Honor to know, from our perspective, this isn't like a typical fraud, where they are taking money from victims and going and buying luxury goods, something like that. I have got no evidence of that. I think this was really about having a little bit of extra spending money, frankly. That doesn't excuse it, but I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, I think you just said it best, that sometimes good people do bad things. Lord knows, I have represented all manner of criminal clients in my career. Charlie falls into that category, Charlie Hernandez, that is, my client, falls into that category of men who I have represented who are really a good person.

Since his arrest in May, I have had many meetings with

Charlie. I have gotten to know him and his family, many of whom are present today in court.

2.1

Just for the record, his mom; his dad; two aunts; cousins; his niece and nephew, who are very much more like a son and daughter rather than simply a niece and nephew to him, and he is very much their father figure; as well as his fiancé, are all present in court.

THE COURT: Thank you all for being here today.

MR. WRIGHT: I can see Charlie made an awful choice.

He had a great career that he really loved, as he described to

me. It was quite glamorous. He flew around the world, has

been everywhere, has seen all manner of wonderful cities and

been to great places.

And he really is a great success story in so many ways, a great immigrant success story. He came to the United States from the Dominican Republic when he was 11 years old. His parents worked hard. His mother and father are here. His father labored at a bodega in Queens. And they are deeply disappointed, deeply disappointed as to the decisions Charlie made, as is his family.

The sense I get is, Charlie was living this, as I said in my memo, this very secret life engaged in this behavior.

And I have spoken to Charlie about it, and he has been quite frank with me, and I think he was frank in the letter that he wrote to your Honor and in the statements that he will make

1 | today, that he wasn't thinking about consequences. He was not.

He was not envisioning him being here today facing the

3 | terrifying prospect of going to a federal jail.

And as the government said, the benefit that Charlie got from this, if you will, was rather meager. It was not a great payoff for Charlie. The risk and the reward just did not match up in any meaningful way.

Since he was arrested, these about eight or nine months, he has done everything that one would hope if someone has been arrested and facing federal prosecution. He has taken this nothing but extraordinarily seriously. He has entered mental health treatment to treat his depression and bipolar factors that may have contributed to the poor decision making he has made in the past but, needless to say, are not an excuse, but I think simply helps explain to him and to his family and fiancé, in particular, to sort of understand and grapple with why Charlie would risk so much.

As the government said, he had a good job, and he really enjoyed it. He loved that job. And as the letters I submitted on behalf of his colleagues, they loved him as well. He was really a well-regarded employee at JetBlue.

Charlie is anguished about today, as maybe you can see. But I will tell you, despite his appearance today, he is doing much better, much better, I can say, than when he was first arrested.

2.1

He expressed to me suicidal ideation. He told that when he was first arrested. There was concern because he had expressed that to the arresting officers, and that was a recommendation of pretrial, that he seek treatment and, again, something that he has faithfully and consistently done.

As I talked about in my memo, Judge, facing the prospect of jail is forboding for anybody, but especially for an openly gay man entering, whether it's the Federal Bureau of Prisons or any jail. Unfortunately, it's perilous to be a gay man in an American jail today, tragically and unfortunately.

I discussed that in my memo, but, needless to say, Judge, that's not a get-out-of-jail-free card, and Charlie understands that, but it is the sad and grim reality of our jails.

There are other concerns as well for him, that he would like to continue in the mental health treatment that he has dutifully been partaking. Jail, of course, would disrupt that, as well as his other concerns about his physical conditions that I talked about in my memo. He is concerned and wants to make sure he can attend to those, as he faithfully has done in taking care of himself.

Judge, our request, and I acknowledge it was a significant variance from what the guidelines recommend and what probation recommended, and I as well, Judge, appreciate deeply the recommendation from the government, as does my

1 | client.

2.1

Our request, again, just was a term of home confinement, community service, a term of postrelease supervision that the Court feels is just and appropriate, and I think that would speak to all of the 3553(a) factors.

And, admittedly, I think the one difficulty we have, if you will, of all of the 3553(a) factors, which I suppose exists in every case, but it is particular to this case, is the issue of general deterrence.

And the government brings up a good point. How do we deter airline stewards or airline employees at any level engaging in this behavior? I don't know. I don't think the world would see -- airline stewards, for instance, would look out and see, oh, Charlie Hernandez got away with this. He got a slap on the wrist. He didn't have to go to jail.

My sense, from speaking to Charlie and speaking to his family, is that the other airline stewards have been traumatized by what happened to Charlie, that it is well known within the industry what happened to Charlie, and that this ordeal has been awful for him, of course, because of his own decision making, no one else's but his.

THE COURT: I often question how much general deterrence works, in certain cases at least. I think in some cases it does. I think more so in the white collar area.

But within this community of flight attendants, I do $\,$

THE COURT: I'm sure.

24

25

To be clear, I don't think, and I don't hear the

government to say that there is a concern about recidivism with respect to Mr. Hernandez. I think specific deterrence is not a concern here.

2.1

I can look at him right now. I can see how scared he looks, honestly how emotional this is. I don't doubt that for a minute. And, as I said earlier, I don't doubt that he is the good person that all of the friends and family who wrote in about him are.

I think, from my perspective, general deterrence and recognizing the seriousness of the crime are the most important or relevant sentencing factors here today.

MR. WRIGHT: I agree completely, your Honor.

If I didn't say, I want to emphasize that Charlie does understand how serious this crime was. He really does. And when his coconspirator was detained back in 2019 and \$60,000 was found on her, he promptly and immediately stopped engaging in this behavior. It hit him hard then. And, of course, once he got arrested, he realized that this is a really serious offense and is sort of the back end, if you will, of the narcotics trade in this country, as the government discussed, that Charlie recognizes that he has, unfortunately and tragically, played a role in that trade.

Again, not something that his parents envisioned when they brought him here as a young boy and not something that Charlie envisioned as he started his otherwise successful

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

All I can say is, I'm sorry for what I did because I didn't have no concern because I didn't know what was right or wrong. But I do now, through my treatment, through everything

productive person that I know I can be.

that I have gone through in this past months, and I hope that you have mercy on me. That's all I can ask from you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez.

You're done, sir?

Take a minute.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: I just want you to allow me to be the son, the brother, and the father figure that I can be to my niece and nephew. Please allow me to do that, your Honor.

> THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez.

I am required to consider the advisory range of 24 to 30 months, as well as various other factors that are outlined in a provision of the law -- it is 18 United States Code Section 3553(a) -- and I have done so.

Those factors include, but are not limited to, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the personal history and characteristics of the defendant, because each defendant must be considered individually as a person.

Judges are also required to consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the offense, afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protect the public from future crimes of the defendant, and avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, among other things.

I think if you ask most judges what the hardest thing

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they do is, it's sentencing. But some sentencings are admittedly harder than others, and this one, as was noted earlier, is especially difficult because, as I said, I don't have any reason to doubt that Mr. Hernandez is a good person, who has done a lot of good things in his life, but he also engaged in this very serious conduct for a lengthy period of time, and I have got to balance all those factors that I just mentioned, which is an especially hard thing to do today.

Mr. Hernandez was among a network of flight attendants that abused their positions to illegally transport drug proceeds from New York City to the Dominican Republic on behalf of an international money laundering operation. As known crew members, they were able to slip through TSA security undetected, and he knew that he was smuggling drug money, and he did it repeatedly for five years. If this had been a week or two weeks or a month, just a short lapse in judgment, I would look at this case differently. But this was five years, with the government estimating that he laundered approximately two and a half million dollars, even if he only received a small portion in return. And he only stopped because he saw someone else get arrested.

Mr. Hernandez, although you didn't sell the drugs yourself, and I know that, you aided and abetted these drug conspiracies to help transport the proceeds internationally. Drugs like fentanyl cause real harm to real people. I've had a

number of cases since I've been a judge where people have died of fentanyl overdoses. I have seen those parents.

I see your parents, your family here today, and how traumatized they are, but I have also seen cases where parents of young people have died with fentanyl doses. Like, this causes real harm to real people, and these organizations can't function without getting their proceeds, right, and you helped in that process. And, as I said, you didn't do it for a week or two weeks or even a year. You did it for five years.

With that said, Mr. Hernandez immediately accepted responsibility. He waived indictment. He pled guilty. He is now 42. He is engaged. He has a history, obviously, of gainful employment. He has no other criminal history. He has no history of violence. So those are all things that I'm considering today.

Most critically, I think, in terms of mitigating factors, Mr. Hernandez has some real physical and mental health issues that present a significant and, as the government noted, unique mitigating factor here.

I want to make sure that he is safe and that he can get whatever medical treatment that he needs.

There is no doubt that Mr. Hernandez is genuinely remorseful. He has been compliant with terms of his pretrial release. But, ultimately, I have to balance the mitigating factors with the need to deter others from engaging in conduct

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

like this, and I really do think deterrence within this community of flight attendants and others who work in that industry is real, so I have done the best I can to balance those factors, and I am ready to impose sentence.

Mr. Hernandez, could you please rise.

It's the judgment of this Court that you be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of three months to be followed by a term of supervised release of three years, nine months of which will be placed on home detention.

I believe that this sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in the law.

You can be seated, sir.

I do want to be clear about one thing. I confirmed before the sentence today that he will not be designated to the Metropolitan Detention Center. And if he is designated there, I want you to reach out to me right away. I am going to make any recommendations that you request, Mr. Wright, with respect to designation, and I'm happy, actually, to make a phone call, as well, to the Bureau of Prisons and follow up more directly than I normally would to ensure that he is placed somewhere where he can be safe and get the medical care that he needs.

Now I am going to read the conditions of your supervised release. You will be on supervised release for three years. As I said, nine months will be on home detention.

The probation office may conduct a search under this condition only when there is reasonable suspicion that you

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

violated a condition of your supervision or committed a new crime and that the areas to be searched contain evidence of this violation or crime. The search must be conducted by a United States Probation Officer, although other law enforcement officers may assist the probation officer. The search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit on a search may be grounds for revocation of release. You must warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition. And I'm imposing this condition because the offense involved receiving and transporting proceeds in a secretive way and to protect the public and deter others. In addition, in light of the mental health issues that have been raised and listed in the presentence report in paragraphs 53 and 54, you must participate in an inpatient mental health treatment program -- sorry. You have no objection to the inpatient? I hadn't

focused on inpatient versus outpatient.

MR. WRIGHT: I had assumed it meant outpatient, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am going to leave that vague. I am just going to say: He must participate in a mental health treatment program approved by the probation office, but I am not specifically going to say inpatient, because I don't know that that's what will be necessary here. And I want the probation

MR. WRIGHT: I know he was evaluated by pretrial, and they felt the current outpatient program he has is appropriate. By all appearances, it seems to be effective.

THE COURT: Why don't I actually specify that it will be outpatient mental health treatment program. If the probation department disagrees, they can come back to me, but I would rather that be the presumption, that it's outpatient.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

2.1

THE COURT: Approved by the probation office.

You must continue to take any prescribed medications unless otherwise instructed by the healthcare provider. You must contribute to the cost of services rendered based on your ability to pay and the availability of third-party payments. The Court authorizes the release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports, including the presentence investigation report, to the healthcare provider. And that's, as I noted, for the reasons noted.

And you will be supervised in the district of your residence.

I'm not going to impose a fine because I think it would be difficult to pay one, particularly with the forfeiture order. I'm imposing the mandatory special assessment of \$100.

The government is not seeking restitution, but I did sign a consent preliminary order of forfeiture money judgment

concerns about that particular jail, let's say it is Fort Dix

or wherever, can I write the Court?

24

25

imposed?

Thank you.

THE COURT:

23

24

25

Is there any legal reason this sentence cannot be

1 MR. GIANFORTI: No, your Honor.

MR. WRIGHT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's the sentence of this Court.

You have a right to appeal your conviction and sentence, except to whatever extent you may have validly waived that right as part of your plea agreement. If you do choose to appeal, the notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. If you are not able to pay for the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, which simply means that court costs, such as filing fees, will be waived. If you request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

As I said earlier, and I say this a lot at sentencing, just because I believe it to be true, I don't think people need to be defined by the worst mistakes they ever made.

Mr. Hernandez you obviously have so much love and support, and I read all those letters. And people described you as charismatic and family oriented and funny and reliable and nurturing and selfless and a remarkable person, and that's all still true. How you are defined in life is just going to be about how you live your life going forward.

But I just felt like this is a sentence I needed to impose, for the reasons that I stated, to deter others from engaging in this serious and harmful conduct, but that doesn't take anything away from sort of who you are and the goodness of